UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/685,169	10/13/2003	Martin Kolb	6570P003	4258

8791 7590 02/23/2007

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD
SEVENTH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030

EXAMINER	
MEHRMANESH, ELMIRA	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2113	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	02/23/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/685,169	KOLB ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Elmira Mehrmanesh	2113	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *24 November 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-27* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☐ Claim(s) *1-27* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *13 December 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to an amendment filed on November 24, 2006 for the application of KOLB et al., for a "SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR TESTING APPLICATIONS AT THE BUSINESS LAYER" filed October 13, 2003.

Claims 1-27 are presented for examination.

Information disclosed and listed on PTO 1449 has been considered.

Claims 1, 8, 13, and 20-27 have been amended.

Claims 1-27 are rejected under 35 USC § 102.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

In response to the amendment to claims 13, and 20-27, the last rejections have been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Robertson (U.S. Patent No. 6,697,967).

As per claim 1, Robertson discloses a method for recording a test script (Fig. 1) comprising:

providing a user interface (Fig. 1, element 11) for entering data and triggering one or more operations to process the data (col. 7, lines 1-9)

translating the data and/or operations to a business layer format (col. 7, lines 37-42)

transmitting the entered data, operations and/or results in the business layer format (col. 5, lines 26-34) from a test plugin (Figure 2, *connections/test server*) at a business layer (Fig. 6, element 42) to a test control program (Fig. 4, element 43, *connections/test server*). Robertson discloses a connection/test server, which breaks script into components the script and generates individual scripts (col. 8, lines 9-12)

receiving results of the data and/or operations in a business layer format (col. 6, lines 5-9)

storing the entered data, operations and/or results in the business layer format within a test script, the test script usable to test an instance of an application at a business layer of the application (col. 5, lines 30-53) and (Fig. 3).

As per claim 2, Robertson discloses converting the business layer formatted data, operations and/or results into a location and/or language-neutral format prior to storing (col. 7, lines 37-42).

As per claim 3, Robertson discloses the location and/or language-neutral format is based on a predefined XML schema (col. 7, lines 49-54).

As per claim 4, Robertson discloses providing the translated data and/or operations to a presentation layer, the presentation layer preparing the data and/or operations according to predefined presentation logic, generating the results of the data and/or operations, and providing the results to a user interface, the user interface displaying the results of the operations to a user (col. 5, lines 30-53).

As per claim 5, Robertson discloses storing the entered data within a test data container (Fig. 4, element 44) rather than directly within the test script, the entered data accessible while testing the instance of the application via a command interface of the test script (col. 7, lines 37-42).

As per claim 6, Robertson discloses the user interface comprises a browser, the method further comprising: initializing the browser with a uniform resource locator ("URL"), the URL having a first component identifying an application from which the test script is to be recorded and a second component specifying parameters for recording of the test script (col. 7, lines 1-9).

As per claim 7, Robertson discloses one of the parameters comprises a location where said test script is to be stored (col. 8, lines 8-21).

As per claim 8, Robertson discloses a method for testing an application (Fig. 1) comprising:

transmitting a series of business layer data and associated operations to an instance of a business layer of an application (Fig. 1, element 11), the application processing the test data and associated operations (col. 7, lines 1-9) to generate business layer (Fig. 6, element 42) results (col. 3, lines 56-59)

transmitting the business layer format (col. 5, lines 26-34) from a test plugin (Figure 2, *connections/test server*) at a business layer (Fig. 6, element 42) to a test control program (Fig. 4, element 43, *connections/test server*). Robertson discloses a connection/test server, which breaks script into components the script and generates individual scripts (col. 8, lines 9-12).

receiving business layer results of the associated operations by the test control program (col. 5, lines 26-34) and (col. 6, lines 5-9)

comparing the business layer results to previously-recorded business layer results to determine whether the application is functioning properly (col. 4, lines 59-62).

As per claim 9, Robertson discloses formatting the business layer data and/or associated operations in a location/language-neutral format prior to providing the business layer data to the instance of the business layer (col. 7, lines 37-42).

As per claim 10, Robertson discloses the location/language-neutral format is defined by an XML schema (col. 7, lines 49-54).

As per claim 11, Robertson discloses formatting the business layer results in a location/language-neutral manner (col. 7, lines 37-42).

As per claim 12, Robertson discloses reading the series of business layer data and associated operations from a test script stored on a test workstation (col. 7, lines 1-9).

As per claim 13, Robertson discloses a test system comprising:

a user interface (Fig. 1, element 11) to receive data and an indication of one or more specified operations to process the data (col. 7, lines 1-9)

a business layer to process the data according to the specified operations (col. 7, lines 37-42) and to generate results of the operations (col. 6, lines 5-9)

a test workstation (Fig. 6, element 42) to receive results of the data and/or operations in a business layer format (col. 5, lines 26-34) from a test plugin (Figure 2, *connections/test server*) at a business layer (Fig. 6, element 42). Robertson discloses a connection/test server, which breaks script into components the script and generates individual scripts (col. 8, lines 9-12) and to transfer the data, operations and/or results of the data and operations to a test control program (col. 6, lines 5-9)

a test script to store the entered data, operations and/or results in the business layer format, the test script usable to test an instance of an application within the business layer (Fig. 6, element 42) of the application (col. 5, lines 30-53) and (Fig. 3).

As per claim 14, Robertson discloses a conversion module to convert the data, operations and/or results into a location and/or language-neutral format prior to storing (col. 7, lines 37-42).

As per claim 15, Robertson discloses the location and/or language-neutral format is based on a predefined XML schema (col. 7, lines 49-54).

As per claim 16, Robertson discloses a presentation layer to prepare the data and/or operations according to predefined presentation logic to display the data and/or operations within a graphical user interface (col. 5, lines 30-53).

As per claim 17, Robertson discloses a test data container (Fig. 4, element 44) to store the entered data, the entered data accessible while testing the instance of the application via a command interface of the test script (col. 7, lines 37-42).

As per claim 18, Robertson discloses a browser initialized with a uniform resource locator ("URL"), the URL having a first component identifying an application

from which the test script is to be recorded and a second component specifying parameters for recording of the test script (col. 7, lines 1-9).

As per claim 19, Robertson discloses one of the parameters comprises a location on a network where said test script is to be stored (col. 8, lines 8-21).

As per claim 20, Robertson discloses an article of manufacture comprising:

a machine accessible storage medium storing instructions that, when executed by a processing system, cause the processing system to perform operations comprising:

providing a user interface (Fig. 1, element 11) for entering data and triggering one or more operations to process the data (col. 7, lines 1-9)

translating the data and/or operations to a business layer format (col. 7, lines 37-42)

receiving results of the data and/or operations in a business layer format (col. 6, lines 5-9)

transmitting the entered data, operations and/or results in the business layer format (col. 5, lines 26-34) from a test plugin (Figure 2, *connections/test server*) at a business layer (Fig. 6, element 42) to a test control program (Fig. 4, element 43, *connections/test server*). Robertson discloses a connection/test server, which breaks script into components the script and generates individual scripts (col. 8, lines 9-12)

storing the entered data, operations and/or results in the business layer format within a test script, the test script usable to test an instance of an application at the business layer of the application (col. 5, lines 30-53) and (Fig. 3).

As per claim 21, Robertson discloses converting the data, operations and/or results into a location and/or language- neutral format prior to storing (col. 7, lines 37-42).

As per claim 22, Robertson discloses the location and/or language-neutral format is based on a predefined XML schema (col. 7, lines 49-54).

As per claim 23, Robertson discloses providing the translated data and/or operations to a presentation layer, the presentation layer preparing the data and/or operations according to predefined presentation logic, generating the results of the data and/or operations, and providing the results to a user interface, the user interface displaying the results of the operations to a user (col. 5, lines 30-53).

As per claim 24, Robertson discloses storing the entered data within a test data container (Fig. 4, element 44), the entered data accessible while testing the instance of the application via a command interface of the test script (col. 7, lines 37-42).

As per claim 25, Robertson discloses the user interface comprises a browser to perform the operations of: initializing the browser with a uniform resource locator ("URL"), the URL having a first component identifying an application from which the test script is to be recorded and a second component specifying parameters for recording of the test script (col. 7, lines 1-9).

As per claim 26, Robertson discloses one of the parameters comprises a location on a network where said test script is to be stored (col. 8, lines 8-21).

As per claim 27, Robertson discloses storing data related to the user interface, the data related to the user interface usable to perform checks on the presentation level data (col. 5, lines 35-44).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed November 24, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to the amendments to claims 1, 8, 13, and 20 applicant argues that Robertson does not teach *transmitting the entered data, operations and/or results in the business layer format from a test plugin at a business layer to a test control program.* Examiner respectfully disagrees. Robertson discloses transmitting the entered data, operations and/or results in the business layer format (col. 5, lines 26-34) from a test plugin (Figure 2, *connections/test server*) at a business layer (Fig. 6, element 42) to a

test control program (Fig. 4, element 43, *connections/test server*). Robertson discloses a connection/test server, which breaks script into components the script and generates individual scripts (col. 8, lines 9-12). Refer to the corresponding section of the claim analysis for details.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1 .136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1 .136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Elmira Mehrmanesh whose telephone number is (571) 272-5531. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-4:30 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert W. Beausoliel can be reached on (571) 272-3645. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ROBERT BEAUSOLIEL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100